

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 have been amended to overcome the indefiniteness thereof.

Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled. Claims 7-10 are new.

New claim 7 depends from claim 1 and recites that there are a plurality of crown plies that have respectively positive and negative angles  $\gamma_1$  whose reinforcement elements are crossed from one ply to the next (see paragraph 0021, second sentence of the specification for support).

Original claim 3 was drafted to cover four distinct possibilities. New, amended claim 3 recites only one of those possibilities, whereas new claims 8-10 recite the other three.

The specification has been amended at page 11 to correct an obvious error. That is, it is clear from the recitation at page 8, penultimate line, that  $\beta_0$  is substantially equal to  $90^\circ$ , and from the recitation at page 9, line 18, that the angle  $\alpha_0$  can equal  $9^\circ$ . Accordingly, it is clear that  $\alpha_0 < \beta$ .

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.



By: \_\_\_\_\_

Alan E. Kopecki

Registration No. 25,813

Date: May 17, 2004

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620